

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,241	12/29/2000	Tateo Uegaki	892_013	8615
25191 7	590 06/02/2004		EXAMINER	
BURR & BROWN			FISHER, MICHAEL J	
PO BOX 7068 SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
511d1e052, 111 15201 7000			3629	
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/753,241	UEGAKI, TATE	UEGAKI, TATEO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Michael J Fisher	3629	NU				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may reply within the statutory minimum of iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Natute, cause the application to become	v a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered tim IONTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	<u> March 2004</u> .						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ T	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers	drawn from consideration.						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to t							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con		,					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	·		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have be eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this Nationa	al Stage				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)					
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (P	PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/753,241

Art Unit: 3629

DETAILED ACTION

The request filed on 3/19/04 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) based on parent Application No. 09/753,241 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malin et al. US 2002/007289 (Malin).

Malin discloses a system with a means for displaying an image (the monitor of the computer), repair-estimation time input (265), repair reserved data storage means (database 250), repair-reservable day/time data display means (the monitor of the computer), repair reservation determining means (resource queues 270), means for

Application/Control Number: 09/753,241

Art Unit: 3629

Page 3

calculating a repair-reservable day/time (fig 1), the calculating means would be visible on the monitor, the system uses different criteria to calculate repair estimation time (265,270,275 and 280), the activities of a plurality of shops and bays is controlled and displayed (220), it would be inherent that if there was a problem the repair-reservation completion day/time could be changed, further, the actual time consumed on a task is recorded (page 5, paragraph 0050, line 12), while not discussed, it would be inherent that any time axis used would be universal throughout the system. Further, it would be obvious to use repair times to schedule repairs. Auto repairs are based on standard times. Specifically, replacing a specific part is charged according to a standard time taken, and not how long it takes a particular mechanic. For example, replacing an alternator would be charged at 1 hour no matter how long it takes the mechanic to do it. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these times to schedule reservations so that the shop works at peak efficiency and there is no 'off' time for mechanics unnecessarily.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J Fisher whose telephone number is 703-306-5993. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

Application/Control Number: 09/753,241

Art Unit: 3629

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MF 47 5/30/04

DEANT. NGUYEN